RRR
ROTHBARD-ROCKWELL REPORT
JUNE 1995 VOLUME VI, NUMBER 5

Why must Christians routinely grovel and apologize for crimes against Jews which they never committed?

by Paul Gottfried

House Speaker Newt Gingrich and other Northeastern Corridor dignitaries believe that shame is a "good thing." Some of the things over which we are supposed to agonize are what the liberal Left considers to be inherited sins, as shown by the speech delivered by Ralph Reed of the Christian Coalition, before the Anti-Defamation League of Bnai Brith. As reported by the *New York Times*, Reed extended the "olive branch" to his group's Jewish critics by saying that he would try harder to overcome "insensitivity" to Christian anti-Semitism.

Reed also disavowed any description to America as a "Christian nation," which he characterized as a "blatant wrong" that "conjured up for Jews historical memories of the Inquisition and other persecutions." He declared his intention to teach the members of the Christian Coalition about the "barbarous acts" inflicted upon Jews by Christian persecutors.

Reed also scolded the "insensitivity" of Pat Robertson who in a 1991 book *The New World Order* complains of the "conspiracy of European bankers" against American interests. Such a reference was taken by the ADL and the *New Republic* to be a veiled attack on Jewish interests; and Reed insists that despite Robertson's fervent Zionism, "if one is insensitive to other Jewish concerns, it does not answer these concerns to say 'I'm pro-Israel.'"

What sense is there, as opposed to breast-beating, in Reed's statements? He did not carry out the "coup" of neutralizing his Jewish-liberal opposition, which Mona Charen ecstatically ascribes to him in a syndicated column. If Reed intends to bring over Jewish liberals to a defense of what he calls "shared values," he might have employed his time more gainfully by staying home and sleeping.

American Jewish organizations, with few exceptions, sustain themselves by calling attention to Christian anti-Semitism. That is why worried donors give them money, namely, to fight the Christian Right and to support Israel as a haven from anti-Semitism. Abe Foxman and other Bnai Brith leaders have no interest in taking positions friendly to Christians, which may drive away their supporters. Nor will their supporters likely change their own politics, as national polls of American Jewry amply confirm.

Most American Jews are on the Left because they fear and dislike committed Christians. Rabbi Daniel Lapin has observed that this obsession has made Jews "rebel against their own biblical tradition."

But this puts the religious cart before the ethnic horse. For thousands of years Jews have survived as a nation in exile at least partly because of their persecutors, particularly in the Catholic and Eastern Orthodox churches. The ritual aspects of Jewish civic religion also reinforced the ethnic culture, but as the ritual life has grown weaker, Jews have depended more and more on evocations of the ancient enemy to stay together. It is irrelevant that American Christians are far better disposed to Jews than vice versa. The Christian enemy is there to help American Jews cohere, and its invocation causes them to finance organizations like Bnai Brith.

IN THIS ISSUE

The Bomb 5
by Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr.

The Return of the Smear Terror 9
by Justin Raimondo

Ending the Racial Spoils System 11
by L.H.R., Jr.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is, furthermore, unclear what Reed and his groups have to atone for, except for their unseemly haste to "reach out" to their most obsessive haters. While Christian anti-Semitism was alive and well in other times and places, it has nothing to do with what ails America today. One is overwhelmed by expressions of Christian good will toward Jews, which are rarely reciprocated.

Evangelicals take special pains to identify their morality with the *Jewish* Mosaic Code, and they cover their auto bumpers with references to Jesus as a "*Jewish* carpenter." A supposed anti-Semite Pat Buchanan invited a Hasidic Rabbi to his home and then to address his American Cause conference, and, as I saw myself, the Catholic and Evangelical rightists in attendance treated Rabbi Yehuda Levin as they might a Christian saint.

None of these sincerely felt gestures ended the attacks on Buchanan or his followers, leveled by Jewish and liberal Christian spokesmen, as anti-Semitic. But it is not Christian anti-Semitism but, as Murray Rothbard used to note, Jewish goy-bashing which has become the characteristic act of tastelessness in our time.

On the reasons, however, Murray and I disagreed. He attributed this "blatant wrong" to Christian niceness combined with Jewish antipathy. My own reading of the dominant culture is more critical. If Christians want to be punching-bags, others will take advantage of their masochism.

American Christians should not express shame for things they never did, and particularly not toward non-Christians who have prospered in a tolerant Christian land. Jewish goy-bashing was more restrained in the fifties and sixties, before *Christians* began to encourage it. As Howard Sachar's *History of the Jews*, written by a Brandeis professor in the late fifties, suggests, even Jewish liberals used to blame the Holocaust on "anti-Christian, pagan Nazis." Sachar stresses the connection between Nazism and "sexual perversion," something which good Jews and Christians once opposed as a commonly recognized evil.

If Christians want to be punching-bags, others will take advantage of their masochism.

If American Jews back then still expressed some residual fear of a Christian enemy, it was less of a hangup than it is now. Nor did Jews until recently look for sodomists with whom to build a common front against the Christian enemy.

What made Jewish behavior different 40 years ago was three factors. One, there was a stress among better established Jews on civility; and informing this courtesy was at least grudging admiration for the Protestant aristocracy and its code of manners. Two, American Christians were willing to tolerate Jews but did not wish to be made to feel ashamed. Least of all were they looking for a guilt trip to be laid on them by those they had never wronged, beyond occasional snubbing.

Finally, everyone with intelligence knew that prejudice was not limited to one side. Christians had persecuted Jews, but Jews had also hated Christians and passed that on to successive generations. The double standard shown by Rabbinic Judaism in dealing with Jews and non-Jews, and the persistence of Jewish ethnocentricity, were facts familiar to most educated American Christians. They also believed, however, that Christian intolerance had aggravated Jewish prejudice, but in a society based on shared ethical values and demonstrated mutual respect, the two sides would learn to get along.

For some years those premises worked, particularly when the Jewish upper-class, made up predominantly of well-mannered German Jews, set the social tone among American Jews. By the postwar years the remnants of job discrimination were also vanishing for even the most recently arrived Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe, a situation which most American Jews noted and appreciated.

Still, there were signs of unease among Jews in the American Zion. This could be seen in the disproportionately high rate of Jewish Communists and Jewish Communist sympathizers, and in the attitudes of some Orthodox Jews who loathed Christians. But most important for understanding the rise of Jewish victimology was the breakdown of American Christian society.

It was respected "Christian" theologians such as Paul Van Buren, Mary Daley, and Malcom Hay, who took the lead in "linking" the Holocaust and the New Testament. This practice was common among liberal Christians before it became widespread among Jewish authors. Though Elie Weisel did stress Christian guilt for the Holocaust as early as 1945, that idea played little role in the dominant Jewish interpretations before the seventies.

The attempts in the eighties by *Commentary* authors such as Hyam Maccoby to father the destruction of European Jewry upon the "crucifixion myth" only recycled a fanciful accusation which Christians had already made about themselves. This in turn reflected a broader attack on Western civilization, which non-Jews as well as Jews have engaged in for years. Jewish victimology in the U.S. has coincided with the up-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

surge of other designated victim movements, black Hispanic, gay, and feminist, and all have enjoyed the support or at least tolerance of the white majority Christian culture.

Not surprisingly, the Christian Coalition has decided to join this culture. Having fessed up to its imaginary sins before black and Hispanic lobbies last spring and summer, its leadership is now playing up to Abe Foxman and other Jewish liberals. When the ADL published its widely distributed broadside against the Christian Right almost a year ago, I was approached by several journals to defend its unjustly attacked Christian targets. In retrospect, I am happy that I refused. The Christian Coalition deserved everything it got, not because of its fictive anti-Semitism but because of its groveling.

Sam Francis, in one of his spirited columns, noted the effect of this groveling was to confirm what Reed's enemies had said all along. As Frank Rich pointed out in the *NYT*, Reed had admitted the truth about the entire wicked history of Christianity, down to the present. What Ralph Reed and his friends should have told Abe Foxman is the following: *Mutual* respect between Jews and Christians means exactly that. Yes, some Christians have abused Jews in the past, but this has not been the case in the U.S., where Christians, particularly Evengelicals, depict Jews as the people of Jesus and the Bible. Now that Christians have cleaned up their act, perhaps Foxman and his Jewish allies can do the same.

A good place to start would be by reading Israel Shahak's blacked-out book *Jewish History, Jewish Religion* (London: Plato Press, 1994). A Holocaust survivor who has spent years in Israel, Shahak dwells on the integral relation between modern Jewish nationalism and the view of Gentiles, particularly of Christians, as presented in Rabbinic Judaism. Writing in the *Jerusalem Report* (April 7, 1994), a friend of Shahak's observes that "In Israel and abroad many Orthodox Rabbis have treated murderous hatred toward non-Jews as a minor doctrinal difference."

Shahak, who cites this observation, notes the alacrity shown by many Orthodox spokesmen in identifying the Palestinians with the Amalekites. In the Rabbinic perspective the commandment to blot out the Amalekites and other ancient Jewish foes who once resided in the land of Israel remains operative forever. Thus the temptation has always been present to associate changing Jewish national enemies with the descendants of peoples earmarked for extermination.

Even more important, Talmudic law does not recognize a Jewish duty to save a non-Jewish life. The saving of a non-Jewish life by a Jew on the Sabbath is explicitly prohibited, since the command of *pikuach nefesh* (the saving of life) is only incumbent upon Jews is dealing with each other. Otherwise the Sabbath and its prohibitions must take precedence over non-essential actions. Shahak digs up *multiple* examples of Rabbinic double standard to which Jews have been exposed for millennnia. He notes the disparaging references to Jesus and the early church which abound in the Talmud—and to which Christians have taken offense. Orthodox Jews still study them as part of a sacred tradition.

The Christian Coalition deserved everything it got, not because of its fictive anti-Semitism, but because of its groveling.

Shahak is right about the connection between the Rabbinic tradition and the persistence of Jewish chauvinism. If he belabors that tie, it is to make sure that others see it as well. The fact that his book has suffered the same fate as my own on the conservative movement, is likewise not surprising. Both of us have clashed with the same neocon-liberal Zionish monolith.

Indeed the only review of Shahak's work known to me is the sympathetic and detailed analysis done by Allan Brownfeld, a Jewish conservative, for *Issues*. No liberal publication, as far as I know, has given space to Shahak's arguments, for an obvious reason. Liberal editors, including those at the *New Republic* and the *Washington Post*, have a vested interest in making Jews appear to be victims in the Christian world.

Reed should take a look at this book before genuflecting again to the double-standard practitioners. In the end, however, Shahak's book does reveal the weaknesses of its own liberal promises. Shahak is a *principled* liberal, unlike the opportunistic ones associated with the American Zionist lobby. He genuinely believes in a utopian world based on "human rights," an ideal which seems to me neither feasible nor desirable. One of my several reaction to his evidence of Zionist intolerance is "So what?" There are certainly worse countries to live in than Israel, even for an American Christian. And what would happen if Israel did not restrict the transfer of property in the way that it does? Within a generation Jews would be living in a land owned by hostile Arabs. With all due respect to my friend Joe Sobran, democracy does not exclude the principle of national survival. Democracy is self-government as practiced by a self-identified people.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In any case the cultural problem that Shahak outlines is one that Israelis must solve for themselves. And though Rabbinic disparagement of gentiles is at least partly based on an odious ethnic revulsion, most Jews by now no longer study the offending texts. Nor does the act of disparagement seem as *sui generis* as Shahak suggests. It is in fact no worse than what both the Catholic and most Orthodox churches said about Jews for centuries. Saints and popes raged against perfidious and usurious Jews, and even the early Protestant Reformation featured some of these medieval attacks, as evidenced by Martin Luther's *Table Talks*.

Happily such anti-Semitic invective has gone out of Christianity entirely, and we are properly reminded of the authentically Jewish origin of the Christian religion. In an excess of good will, moreover, Protestant theologians and Catholic prelates are even blurring any distinction between the Old and New Covenants; and they routinely apologize for crimes against Jews which neither they nor even a less sensitive generation of Christians committed.

Much of this shows a touching generosity, but is also ominous in the present cultural context. Western Christians are eager to apologize to everyone else, including advocates of moral anarchy. Ralph Reed's self-mortification exemplifies this trend, and it is doubtful that he and his cohorts will reconcile their Jewish enemies, as opposed to looking utterly ridiculous.

The most puzzling aspect of Reed's apology is the explicit as well as implicit acceptance of Christian responsibility for the Holocaust. How are the Evangelicals or other American Christians *responsible* for the *Nazi* extermination of European Jewry? Unless my memory fails, I recall that Christians in America, England, and elsewhere fought sacrificially against the Nazis. And they fought in a war from which some of the most vocal present day Jewish victimologists, including A.M. Rosenthal and several prominent neoconservatives, stayed out. (Indeed, even former American Firsters, like the son of the Theodore Roosevelt, had better war records than those who now denounce their group as pro-Nazi.)

Western Christians are eager to apologize to everyone else, including advocates of moral anarchy.

Another question: Why are all Christians to blame for the Inquisition and the Holocaust, but Jews as such are not to be held responsible for the even larger massacres unleashed by Communists in the present century? The Jewish record of excusing and even supporting murderous regimes of the Left is far grimmer than the Christian record of collaboration with Hitler.

A Polish Jewish historian, Richard Pipes, tries to explain the social causes of this Jewish affinity for Communism in Eastern and Central Europe, but does not excuse. Recently in reading in *Time* about a Jewish Stasi chief, whom the Germans were about to try for his past brutality, I was struck by the repeated attempt to depict him as a Holocaust victim. Why is this man to be seen as a victim, while Nazi-collaborators are rarely excused as the past victims of Stalinist crimes?

The typical left-liberal imbalance in assigning blame to the servants of murderous regimes becomes even worse when one factors in the present unnatural relation between Jews and Christians. Here one side can do no wrong while the other can do no right, except when apologizing. Why are Foxman and the ADL not required to apologize to the Christian kinsmen of those killed by Communist regimes in which Jews played prominent roles, but American Christians must now atone for every Christian act of intolerance, no matter when it occurred?

Why are American Jewish leftists not to be held accountable, as Jews, for the acts of Russian Jewish Communists, even if they defended the Soviet system, but Southern Evangelicals in 1995 must bear responsibility for the unkindness of Spanish Catholics in 1492?

Another example of this double standard might be cited to make my point clearer. For a long time the liberal establishment, Christian and Jewish, pretended that all slave traders were white Christians, which is historically inaccurate. The purveyors of this factoid only grew indignant when blacks implicated Jews specifically in the slavetrade. While the first statement is false, the second is at least partially true: Sephardic Jews, such as those who settled in Rhode Island and in the Carolinas, sometimes did make money by trading in slaves. The same was true for Christians and for many African animists.

Let me repeat that collective guilt or collective innocence is not the issue in question. Nor is there cause for anyone to appear in sackcloth because his ancestors sold or bought slaves. What is being argued for is evenhandedness; and the main reason I would suggest that American Christians do not receive it in their dealings with others is their insistence on being treated like dishrags. This will continue to be the problem as long as those like Ralph Reed mistake groveling for a coup.■

Professor Paul Gottfried
is author of *The Conservative Movement.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Bomb

by Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr.

The Oklahoma City bombing has deep implications for the future of liberty in America. The establishment Left and the neoconservative Right tried to use the event to silence every serious critic of government power. But it had the opposite effect. For it revealed the lying media for what they are, and galvanized the freedom movement to resist future violations of individual rights like Waco and Ruby Ridge.

Conservatives and libertarians—after being subjected to a reign of terror similar to the smears of the Old Right and the Goldwater movement—now understand the central government for the would-be totalitarian state that it is, and the opposition media for the willing handmaidens they are.

To understand the meaning of the bombing, consider that the President almost disappeared from history earlier this spring. Here's how the *Washington Post* described Clinton's "Snooze Conference" the day before the Oklahoma bombing: "Clinton was reduced to pleading his own relevance. It turned out the President didn't have much to say—and, to be fair, the reporters didn't have much to ask." People "had trouble staying alert." Only CBS carried the event live. "The presidency is shrinking," concluded the *Post*.

Less than 12 hours later, Clinton was Master of the Universe. The Great Pants Dropper bestrode the country like a colossus, controlled the media, and as the nation's new moral leader, denounced the bombers as "evil cowards." He even, with the geekess Janet Reno, called for a quick death penalty.

Aren't liberals supposed to favor rehabilitation? Well, it depends. The criminals who murder mere taxpayers are poor babies deprived of playground equipment when young, and deserve leniency. The criminals who murder federal employees must be immediately executed.

We saw Franklin D. Clinton wielding his terrible, swift sword, comforting the afflicted, and holding a therapy session for the children of federal workers (with the children coming away terrified).

Then Clinton picked up his Bible—perhaps the one Hillary had famously thrown at him after one of their fights—and presided over a nationally televised church service. Also present was the Rev. Billy Graham, longtime pastor to the central state, who suggested that Slick Willie was such an eloquent moral voice that he could justly fill "any pulpit in America."

Conservatives and libertarians now understand the central government for the would-be totalitarian state that it is.

Maybe such a post was in the First Satyr's future, said Graham, but of course only after Clinton had served two terms.

For the White House, gory days were glory days. Clinton was finally being taken seriously. He was respected. He was a leader. In contrast to the day before the bombing, people hung on his every word. His moment had arrived.

So Clinton—typically—overreached. The media, looking for a Message in the rubble, had declared part of it to be this: if terrorism can happen in the heartland, it can happen anywhere. So Americans should be terrorized and let the federal government protect them with a police state.

That interpretation of the bombing was based on the idea that it was a random act directed at America. In that case, everyone would have reason to fear. It also fit in nicely with the initial theory of blame: the Arabs.

We heard that Arabs attended the University of Oklahoma, that Oklahoma City was a hotbed of Islamic Fundamentalism, and that the FBI had files on all the Arab goings-on. (We were also told that the FBI's hands were tied on investigating suspicious groups. In fact, its power is already virtually unlimited.) Some media-motivated people, notes Christopher Hitchens in the *Nation*, even stormed the house of an Iraqi couple in Oklahoma City, shouting about Muslims and terrorists. They broke windows and drove the seven-months pregnant wife from room to room in terror. She went into premature labor and gave birth to a dead baby. Of course, no officials attended the funeral, and it was unreported in the national media. Then the composite sketches of the putative bombers were released, and the Arabs were quickly forgotten.

Thanks to a government-media campaign, the blame was suddenly shifted to "extremists," especially to the militias. Yet the state and local militias are one of the most notable and impressive innovations in political action in decades. While Capitol Hill conservatives were babbling about the line-item veto, real Americans were beginning to exercise their Constitutional rights. They read history and, in the spirit of our ancestors, formed associations to defend themselves in an increasingly dangerous world.

Uniquely, the militia movement has no central leader, no special status from the tax police or any other part of the government, no nation-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wide mailing list, and no Beltway headquarters. It began at the grass roots and has stayed there, meaning it is not controlled by Washington or Wall Street, and is therefore hated by both. They are also armed, albeit defensively. It was inevitable that they would come under fire.

Also attacked were "right-wing extremists" in general, defined as anyone who thinks the federal government is a pain in the neck. But why is the charge of extremism, long a liberal device to shut down dissent, supposed to be a refutation? Because it's wrong to disagree with the Establishment on any substantive issue? Of course. Notice too that no leftist is ever dubbed an extremist.

Why is the charge of "extremism," long a liberal device to shut down dissent, supposed to be a refutation?

One prime charge against the militia movement was that it taught Tim McVeigh his disregard for human life, or even helped him build the bomb (presuming he killed all those people).

But all reports indicate that the Northern Michigan Militia kicked McVeigh and his friends out of a meeting when they made trouble. This fits with everything we know about the militias: they are serious, patriotic, and not interested in troublemakers.

By the standards of American history, the militias—which adhere to the plain meaning of the Constitution and want the federal government to do so as well—are relatively mainstream. Many members hold to the "religion of Christianity," as one alarmed Association Press dispatch put it.

The only militia group that found any use for McVeigh was the U.S. government's. He was highly decorated during the War on Iraq, winning the Bronze Star, the Army Commendation Medal, the Army Achievement Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, the Southwest Asia Service Medal with two Bronze Stars, the Kuwait Liberation Medal, and the Combat Infantryman Badge. He served in the same unit as Terry Nichols, who is being held as a material witness in the bombing.

Here's how it works. You're decorated when you kill civilians and children in aggressive wars against countries that have never done anything to us. You're rewarded when you kill civilians and children in Waco or Ruby Ridge. But you get killed when you kill civilians and children in a U.S. government building.

The liberals in the media kept up the drumbeat against any and all antigovernment sentiment—with the *Wall Street Journal*, the *New York Times*, and National Public Radio being the most egregious. The focus, they said, should be on anyone who thinks the BATF and FBI went too far in Waco.

According to the *Times*, the "ashes of the Davidians' compound have become a dark and violent text for right-wing militants, in which many have read a call to bitter hostility to the Government." (Note: the *Times* always capitalizes the word Government.) The article went on to discuss—also in typical *Times* fashion—the Klan and "neo-Nazi skin heads."

Yet the idea that only crazies worry about the murders at Waco or Ruby Ridge is hardly plausible. The day of the bombing, the *Washington Times* ran one news story and two op-eds detailing the unanswered questions about Waco.

In fact, as much as the feds and the media hate it, there is an industry that does nothing but gather and report information about the Waco siege, and it's not dominated by "paranoids," but by professors and journalists who see in the attack a textbook case of big-government malevolence.

Some stories even attributed the bombing to the 10th amendment movement, forgetting for a moment that this is supposedly led by Bob Dole. The property-rights movement was named as well and, inevitably, "angry white men." (A possible alternative title, I keep thinking, for this publication.)

Finally, we were told that the guilty parties were all those who think, in the words of the *New York Times*, that the government is "too big and too intrusive." Well, that's about 85% of the American people. Perhaps, as the liberals like to say, all of society is to blame.

But then Clinton made his error. He mentioned talk radio hosts as "promoters of paranoia" who use the "airwaves" to spread "hate." After four insufferable days of secret politicking, he had switched to open politicking. He conceded in a later speech that while unfortunately "they" do have free speech rights, "we" also have them and are going to use them to denounce "hate." Hate is another one of those useful smears like extremism. Aren't we supposed to hate, say, the militias? Of course we are, but we are not allowed to dislike Washington, D.C., the media, or any other part of the ruling class.

Up until this time, the Right had been silent or apologetic. The editorial page of one conservative paper even denounced Americans who think we have a "supposedly tyrannical government." But once Clinton made his agenda clear—to smear everyone who doubted the absolute authority and goodness of the central state—conservatives and libertarians began to speak out. This was despite an almost universal fear of the possibility of BATF or FBI investigations, and the certainty of media libel.

The men and women of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Right realized that Bill Clinton would try to turn this bombing to his political advantage, as he does with everything except his concubines. Still, his arrogance was astonishing. He actually compared criticism of the government to promotion of terrorism. In this effort, he was as aided by the neocon press as by the liberal, both of which conducted witch hunts reminiscent of the smears of the Old Right during the New Deal.

But Clinton was not smart. He was openly using other people's deaths to deflect attacks on himself and his wife for their corruption in every sense. Indeed, Hillary was also sickening in her role of Comforting Mom for the Children of America, at least those she doesn't want to abort. That very weekend, they had been deposed under oath by the Whitewater special counsel, and it was hardly noticed.

The Clintons were reaching, but what did they have to lose? Clinton, after all, didn't win a majority in 1990. His and Hillary's private activities are common knowledge. Their socialized health plan bit the dust. He lost the mid-term elections. Then the dollar fell and the economy continued to slog. To top it off, a well-organized and dedicated opposition plausibly accuses Bill and Hillary of everything from bribe-taking to winking at murder. So they struck back.

They were helped by the entire liberal network. Consider the full-page ads taken out by a federal union a week after the bombing. "The United States of America is a government [catch that?] of, by and for the people," claimed the American Federation of State, Country, Municipal Employees. "Next time you hear someone viciously attack our government, and the Americans who work for it, tell them—STOP IT. THIS IS OUR GOVERNMENT."

Oh? In the real America, we drink freedom with our mothers' milk. Even a powerful and orchestrated smear can't purge that from our hearts or from our history. So when the public realized what was going on, there was a backlash against Clinton and the media. The talk show hosts fought back, and the freshmen Republicans denounced Clinton and the media as well, despite a chilling attempt to connect Steve Stockman (R-TX) with the bombing because his office had received an early faxed report on it.

The freshmen, unlike Gingrich and Dole, also questioned Clinton's "anti-terrorism" bill to expand federal police supervision of everyone who questions the feds. They pointed out that the bombing's root cause was centralization, especially of police power, and the abuses it leads to, and therefore exactly the wrong response was more centralization.

When Ted Koppel took his *Nightline* show to Decker, Michigan, and asked people their opinions of the government, the masses were all too forthcoming. They said: a) it's possible that the government had a hand in the bombing; b) they definitely fear the government; and c) they still wanted answers about what happened at Waco. That will teach Ted not to leave the Washington/New York corridor.

The bombing's root cause was centralization, especially of police power; therefore exactly the wrong response was more centralization.

Even further outside it, in London, *The Spectator* reported the kind of cold-water truth that never appears in the American media, now dedicated to convincing us that civilian federal employees were the virtual heart and soul of Oklahoma City and America, and if they're not beloved in your life too, you must be an evil coward.

"The Federal Building," reported Mark Steyn, "exists in the same relationship to Oklahoma City as the Chinese Embassy does to London. It is not Oklahoman; it represents a remote and not entirely benign power. And with the exception of the armed forces and local postmistress (though not the post office itself), most Okies don't give a skunk's patootie about federal agencies."

Koppel had been most taken aback by all the people who thought that the government might be behind the bombing. What he didn't know was that circumstantial evidence to this effect had floated around the country for days before his show was taped.

Some bomb experts suggested a car bomb could not have caused this type of linear damage, and thus there had to be other bombs in the building. Others said that there were two blasts, not one. Some people said that undercover agents could have provoked the act. The Congressional hearings on the BATF and Waco are now indefinitely delayed, and there are no more calls to abolish the BATF and turn its unconstitutional duties (alcohol, tobacco, and firearms being no business of the federal government's) over to the FBI. Still others pointed out that the government employs squads of professional assassins in such agencies as the CIA, which has used carbombs in Lebanon.

Other suspicious types pointed out that in the investigation of a murder, the first question is "*Cui bono*?" Who benefits? The fact that a grandson is made richer by his grandfather's death doesn't mean he pushed the old man down the stairs, but he's the first one the cops look at. The only entity to benefit from this bombing, these same people

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

point out, is the central government.

How can the Establishment pretend to be shocked at such speculation? This is, after all, a country where books on the JFK assassination—which the rotten Earl Warren tried to blame on the Right—still contribute substantially to the GNP. It is silly to think that people wouldn't look beyond the Official Story.

The government and its friends tell us that the bombing was definitely not the work of a Lone Nut, but rather of a vast right-wing conspiracy. Lee Harvey Oswald, on the other hand, was definitely a Lone Nut, and acted entirely on his own.

If the government had wanted to prevent this bombing, not a police state but a full-scale investigation of Waco, and a subsequent prosecution of the killers, might have done it. Instead, the Executive Branch paid tribute to the agents who were killed in the raid, exterminated everyone else (a fact which even the mainstream media has stopped denying), and punished the Branch Davidians who were away from their home with a 40-year prison term.

If the Waco siege taught us about the nature of government power, the Oklahoma bombing has taught us about what liberals and neocons really want: a total shutdown of right-wing dissent by means of intimidation or, even better, by "hate speech" laws that forbid the distribution of material deemed paranoid, racist, or antigovernment. If such laws ever do pass, it won't just be Nazi novelists in West Virginia who go to jail, but anyone outside of the mainstream who bothers the government.

Already, in the days following the bombing, the FBI raided house after house. In Arizona, they visited a trailer park where Tim McVeigh had lived fully two years earlier. Spying a "Don't Tread on Me" flag on one trailer, the agents surrounded the place, forced the man out, and searched and destroyed his home.

Is this the America we can look forward to? Where federal agents can bust down your door for flying a flag of the American Revolution? Where the sentiments of 1776 constitute "probable cause"? Yes, as the *Washington Post* pointed out, the American Revolution had a "dark side": it was "antagonistic to government and to centralized government power."

Is this the America we can look forward to? Where federal agents can bust down your door for flying a flag of the American Revolution?

Beside, granting new powers to an already oppressive federal police won't stop domestic terrorism. It will only confirm the belief of many groups that the government is out to get them, and alienate even more people from the political process.

It is this alienation that can tempt unstable people to violence. Only returning power to the states and localities, and guarding against any more Waco-like raids, will undo this alienation: not a million-man FBI.

The federal building in Oklahoma City should not be rebuilt, and all the other federal buildings should be sold to private enterprise or torn down. The feds have plenty of office space in D.C. They should not be allowed to have imperial outposts in the sovereign states.

Finally, Bill Clinton, the media, and all those who assisted them should never be forgiven for using the Oklahoma tragedy to create a *real* climate of fear, in which many decent Americans wondered whether the feds would soon be breaking down their door to confiscate their guns and subversive literature, before hauling them off to seditious libel trials.

The Return of the Smear Terror

by Justin Raimondo

As the American Right picks itself up off the ground, recovers its senses, and wonders what to make of the Oklahoma City bombing, conservatives must turn to the history of their own movement to get some perspective on the problem they now face. As they brave a barrage of smears from a hostile media and a President desperate for any political advantage, they should remember that conservatives have faced similar crises on at least three previous occasions.

The first attempt to marginalize the Right occurred in the 30s, and was largely successful. Fighting the New Deal and FDR's drive to war, the pre-World War II Old Right fought heroically against overwhelming odds, and was finally driven underground by state repression.

In the postwar period, a rightwing resurgence threatened to sideline the Truman administration, just as conservatives are upstaging Clinton today; the response of the Left (and the Eastern Republican Establishment) was a furious campaign of calumny that has its echoes in today's anti-"extremist" hysteria.

In the 60s, when the Right took the GOP back from the Rockefeller wing of the Republican party, liberals raised the specter of "extremism" and linked GOP presidential candidate

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Barry Goldwater with the much-demonized John Birch Society.

It was the noted author, journalist, and courageous Old Right leader John T. Flynn who first put a name to what we are experiencing today: he called it "The Smear Terror," in a pamphlet of the same name published in 1947. At the time, the Left was moving in to wipe out the last remnants of resistance to the New Deal, seeking to link the Old Right with Hitler and Tojo, and conducting a series of trials for "sedition" designed to drive the Old Right out of American politics. In describing the methodology of the smear terrorists, Flynn wrote:

> Briefly here is the trick: First it is necessary to select what I call a Smear Carrier, some person who is either guilty or actually convicted of an offense is selected. He is loaded with infamy for all to see. He, however, is not the real intended victim. The real victim is some prominent senator or congressman or political or business leader or writer against whom nothing could be proved and who could not be libeled with impunity. Having completely covered the Smear Carrier with guilt, the smearer proceeds to link him with the real victim. He merely mentions that the intended victim knows the Smear Carrier, or that he has written him a letter or got one from him or received him in his office or appeared at some public meeting with him. By mentioning the victim frequently in this way the reader gradually absorbs the feeling that there is something wrong with him. . . . [I]f every time the Smear Carrier is mentioned he is referred to as the 'friend of Senator X,' it will not be long before the senator himself is as effectively smeared as the Smear Carrier whose guilt has been splashed on him.

This is as accurate an assessment of what is happening in the Oklahoma bombing case as you are likely to read in a contemporary journal. Today's Smear Carrier is Timothy McVeigh, and a small group of weirdos and ne'er-do-well — and the intended victim is the rising tide of rightwing populism that threatens to topple the federal tyranny.

Students of propaganda techniques can only stand in awe of the smear campaign now being unleashed against the American Right. Like a well-oiled machine, its parts meshing and moving in perfect unison, the mainstream media put out the official government line: that Timothy McVeigh, the accused mad bomber, is a member of the Michigan Militia, and more than likely a small cog in a vast conspiracy to overthrow the federal government by force of arms.

Students of propaganda techniques can only stand in awe of the smear campaign now being unleashed against the American Right.

But Timothy McVeigh was never a member of the Michigan Militia or of any other regular militia organization. In fact, McVeigh and his friends, Terry and James Nichols, attended exactly *one* meeting of the Northern Michigan militia— and were asked to leave when they began acting as if they were provocateurs, lunatics, or both. Seemingly intent on casting as wide a net as possible, the Justice Department has embarked on a campaign to smear, harass, and destroy the burgeoning militia movement— and in this they have plenty of support in the media.

It doesn't take much research to demonstrate that the ideology of McVeigh, and the Nichols brothers, is far too rich a mix for the average Middle American to digest. They are members of the "Patriot' movement, a tiny dissident faction actively seeking a military confrontation with the feds. Whereas the mainstream militias are purely defensive and have a more political character, the Patriots insist that an armed conflict is not only inevitable but imminent.

Their online catalog prominently features the videos of one Mark Koernke, described therein as "an ex-military 96B intelligence analyst / 97C counter intelligence coordinator." In reality, the 37-year-old Koernke works as a janitor at the University of Michigan, in Ann Arbor. He broadcast his own shortwave radio show, "Mark from Michigan," until his sponsor took him off the air, but his main activity seems to be the production of dozens of videotapes, all directed at the militia movement. In "America in Peril" and a series of "Home Seminars," Koernke predicts a fiery Armageddon pitting the militias against the U.S. government, in what he calls an "American Holocaust 1995."

It was Koernke who sent the following cryptic fax message to the office of freshman Rep. Steve Stockman (R-Texas) an hour before the bomb went off: "First update. Bldg 7 to 10 floors only. Military people on scene— BATF/FBI. Bomb threat received last week. Perpetrator unknown at this time. Oklahoma."

For a janitor, Koernke sure gets around: he has spoken in Bakersfield, California, at Hillsdale College, at meetings in South Carolina, and— although Koernke denies it— in Florida, where he was allegedly spotted in the company of McVeigh. Lurking around the edges of the militia movement, Koernke is a publicity hound who nevertheless does seem to have some connection to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

McVeigh, as well as Terry and James Nichols, according to Michigan Militia sources. Yet the authorities have shown absolutely no interest in Koernke, a fact that he frequently complains of. The FBI's lack of interest in him is indeed curious given the fact that they have rounded up anyone and everyone even vaguely connected with McVeigh, including his sister— even serving the editor who published McVeigh's letters a newspaper in upstate New York with a subpoena.

This lack of interest in Koernke on the part of law enforcement officials is inexplicable— unless one considers that pursuit of the Koernke connection would lead away from the broader link the government is trying to establish between McVeigh and the regular militia movement. For Koernke has organized his own independent "security team" of 20 to 30 members, a group entirely outside the regular Michigan Militia. Critical of the regular militia for having public meetings, and rebuking the militia leadership for talking to reporters, his tiny group of "Patriots" apparently advocates going "underground"— although this does not seem to stop Koernke from getting in front of a television camera.

If the FBI has no interest in Koernke, then certainly others find him useful. Koernke is naturally being played up in the media as the chief ideologue of the militias: if he didn't exist, it would have been necessary to invent him.

New York Times columnist Frank Rich [April 27, 1995] links Pat Robertson to Koernke. Falsely claiming that Koernke is "a favorite of far-right militias in general," Rich goes on to point out that both oppose the "New World Order" and the United Nations, and that therefore "both ... have thrown gasoline on the psychotic fires of the untethered militias running around this country."

From McVeigh to Koernke to Robertson to the GOP to anybody who dares criticize the would-be world planners and their corporate sponsors — this is the "splash" method in operation, as described by Flynn nearly half a century ago, essentially unchanged, working efficiently, if a little crudely.

From McVeigh to Koernke to Robertson to the GOP to anybody who dares criticize the would-be world planners and their corporate sponsors — this is the "splash" method in operation.

In another column, published a week later, Rich posits a fantastic conspiracy theory that links everyone from Pat Robertson to the gun groups to the anti-abortion movement. "What is clear," he writes, "is how extensively the nation's far-right factions are interconnected, forming a political network that often publicly espouses the same ideology as the terrorists in our midst, much as the Sinn Fein speaks aboveground for the I.R.A." Again we meet up with the convenient Koernke, who is linked to Larry Pratt, the head of the Gun Owners of America. Pratt's sin: he made a speech at "Preparedness Expo 96," an event at which Koernke also appeared. By the standards of the new McCarthyism, this is sufficient evidence to condemn not only Pratt but Rep. Steve Stockman. Why Stockman? "And who is the biggest recipient of campaign funds from Mr. Pratt's Gun Owners of America," asked Rich. "None other than Representative Steve Stockman, the Texas Republican who last week denied any connection to militias when asked to explain the mysterious fax his office received after the Oklahoma bombing."

Stockman enraged the sellout House Republican leadership early on when he refused to compromise on the three fifths vote requirement for passage of a tax hike. In March, he wrote a letter to Attorney General Janet Reno in response to rumors that the government was about to move in on the militias: "A paramilitary-style attack against Americans who pose no risk to others . . . would run the risk of an irreparable breach between the Federal Government and the public." For trying to avert another Waco-style bloodbath, Stockman is not only being smeared by the Left but also stabbed in the back by the Republican party. According to *Newsweek*, "top Republicans in Texas are urging prominent Democrats to switch parties to challenge Stockman in the '96 GOP primary— and offering to raise money for them." The magazine also quotes anonymous "Texas law enforcement authorities" who "are convinced that militia members in the Beaumont area worked in Stockman's campaign." [May 8, 1995]

Another intended victim of the witch-hunters is Rep. Helen Chenoweth (R-Idaho), who has dared publicize the abuses of the BATF and other federal agencies. *Newsweek* notes disapprovingly that Chenoweth "gave militia members a platform" at a hearing held in Boise," and *Roll Call*, the voice of the inside-the-Beltway crowd, labeled both Stockman and Chenoweth part of the "Paranoid Fringe." Rep. Joe Knollenberg, a Republican from suburban Detroit, is under attack for having once spoken at a Gun Owners of America event, sharing the platform with members of the Michigan Militia.

Frank Rich sums up the rationale for and motivation behind the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

new McCarthyism by quoting one Frederick Clarkson, described as one of the Justice Department's "researchers on the radical right," on the subject of the abortion clinic bombings: "If that had happened at churches or newspapers or Federal office buildings, we would have called it terrorism. But society didn't want to see the pattern." But now the picture is starting to come into focus, says Rich, the grand design of the Rightist Conspiracy:

> Now that we're ready to recognize the complexity of that pattern, we also see that even when all the Oklahoma City bombing suspects are arrested, the investigation will have only just begun.

In between pious exhortations for "unity" and "togetherness" in the face of this national tragedy, Rich and his fellow mandarins of liberal "tolerance" are rubbing their hands with glee and shrieking for the blood of their enemies. From their perspective, punishing those responsible for the crime is almost beside the point: what we really have to do is go after the "aboveground" wing of the seditious Right, the Larry Pratts, the Steve Stockmans, the Helen Chenoweths, as well as the militias themselves, which have always been legal and public organizations, openly meeting and working to recruit citizens to their cause.

Senator Bob Dole likened the war against the alleged threat of domestic terrorism to World War II, and, in signaling support for Clinton's Draconian attack on civil liberties, declared that "partisanship ends at the terror's edge." However inadvertently, Dole puts the threat we face in its proper historical perspective. In many ways, the aftermath of the Oklahoma City bombing echoes the domestic political consequences of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor: a frontal assault on the First Amendment, sedition trials premised on a grand conspiracy theory, and a ferocious hate campaign carried out in the mainstream media against anyone suspected of anti-war sympathies. Once again a campaign of defamation, frame-up, and repression is being carried out by those who consider themselves liberals.■

Once again a campaign of defamation, frame-up, and repression is being carried out by those who consider themselves liberals.

Rothbard-Rockwell Report (ISSN 1080-4420) is published monthly by the Center for Libertarian Studies, 875 Mahler Rd., Suite 150, Burlingame, CA 94010. (800) 325-7257. Second-Class Postage paid at Burlingame, CA 94010 and additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Send address changes to Rothbard-Rockwell Report, P.O. Box 4091, Burlingame, CA 94011. *Editors:* Murray N. Rothbard (1926–1995) and Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr. *Contributing Editors:* Sarah Barton, Paul Gottfried, Joe Melton, Justin Raimondo, and Joseph Sobran. *Publisher:* Burton S. Blumert. Managing Editor: Sybil Regan. Subscription: $49 for 12 issues. Single issue: $5. Copyright ©1995 by the Center for Libertarian Studies. All rights reserved. Unauthorized reproduction of this newsletter or its contents by xerography, facsimile, or any other means is illegal.

Ending the Racial Spoils System

by L.H. R., Jr.

C-Span did the Republicans a great service by televising Congressional hearings on affirmative action. This is a subject the average viewer knows a lot about, through bitter personal experience. The Democrats, on the other hand, come across like Colin Ferguson: denying all guilt, and pretending not to know what the fuss is all about.

The liberals should hear dinner conversation in the average American home. Tales of quota-style injustice are legion. Dad is passed up for a promotion while a known incompetent soars up the ladder. The eldest son can't get the job he wants because the company needs minorities. The family is in debt for college tuition, while the less qualified get full scholarships. Even in high school, good students are denied honors classes to make room for Official Victims.

Business owners and bankers know something about this too. They have to bow and scrape when the ethnically privileged walk in the door. It could be a government "tester" for one of the dozens of agencies who use them. It could be the first of a 1,000 person class-action lawsuit that will lead to bankruptcy. In self defence, the bank gives bad loans, the business owner tries not to advertise job openings, and the college gives its degrees away.

The liberals pretend all this is imaginary. Complaints are nothing more than mutterings of people losing a monopoly of power. It's irrational white backlash. Affirmative action is just creating opportunities, they say. They cite the "progress" of woman and blacks since 1964, and insultingly suggest that none of it would have been possible without legal preferences.

Taking on quotas and affirma-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tive action is a gargantuan task. But to repeal officially mandated discrimination is going to require more legal root canal than even most conservative Republicans are willing to consider.

It's not enough to eliminate explicit government contracts for official victims, as good a step as that would be. And it's not enough to repeal programs that set aside jobs and money for anyone but white men.

Quotas, set-asides, and affirmative action are merely the legal symptoms of a much more fundamental disease: the coercive statutes giving federal judges veto power over nearly every admissions and hiring decision in the public and private sector. Republicans must target anti-discrimination law itself. Only this drastic step will restore a free market in labor, the freedom of association and contract, and social peace.

Anti-discrimination law says we can't make decisions "on grounds of" or "because of" this or that criterion. That is, it forbids having the wrong intention, which is a subjective state of mind.

Let's say we had a law that said: "Marriages contracted under the age of 25 must be based on the grounds of love and no other reason." It would be enforced with fines of $100,000. Is there any doubt where such a law would lead? Certainly not to more loving young couples. Everyone would wait until age 26 to get married.

The advocates of such a law can protest that this is not what they have in mind. They can claim they were just trying to promote romance. But the legal logic says otherwise. The only way to enforce certain kinds of intentions is by mandating certain kinds of effects.

It is anti-discrimination law, not quotas, that allows the government to enforce multiculturism in every business in America. Businessmen pass over more qualified candidates for hiring and promotion because they fear the costs of lawsuits. What looks like a quota is actually defensive action against federal courts that like to count the numbers. Bean counting may be unfair and inefficient, but it is the only way that anybody has found to enforce the law.

Ban every quota in the country, and business would still be subject to bankruptcy-threatening class-action suits. End every set-aside, and you still have whole housing complexes harassed for keeping out criminals. Abolish *all* affirmative action, and colleges will still have to recruit the intellectually challenged to avoid the appearance of discrimination.

That's why the central government needs to be stripped of its power to determine if anyone is discriminating or giving preferences (or even what constitutes either). Without anti-discrimination law, every employee would be planned and wanted. Business would be free to advertise for job openings without fear of lawsuits. There would be no quota loans from banks. The universities could get back to being places of learning.

Someday, we may even recover the original meaning of the term discrimination: choosing among several options. We stop discriminating only when we stop making choices.■

Recently discovered Rothbard-at-college video...

Rothbard skins Clinton

Dear Subscriber:

Murray was one hell-raiser when he spoke. He was polite and soft-spoken, but when he took off after the inanities of our so-called leaders, he could be brutal.

This video, recorded live in June of '94 at a major California university, is Murray at his rollicking, outrageous best. What a destruct job he did on Clinton! What the IRS does to you and me, he did to Clinton: peeked into all those private little places. In this speech, just rediscovered by an incredible skein of serendipitous events, Murray...

- Demolishes Clinton's much bally-hooed "Workfare" program, and shows how it will actually get MORE people onto welfare, costing more of your bucks and mine, not less.
- Clinton's a back-door man, regulatorily as well as culturally. And Murray nails him beautifully on his backdoor scheme to get your guns. Unnoticed as yet by the NRA, Murray shows how the overt regulatory schemes have little impact. But this backdoor method — supported by Gingrich — WILL disarm America if allowed to go unchallenged.
- Why Clinton's (and Ging-rich's) talk of cutting the deficit is a knowing lie. No truth, whatsoever to it.
- How Clinton's "National Service" program" — that the neo-cons ooh and ahh over — is nothing more than another huge, tax-payer funded boondoggle.
- Why the Reagan/Bush/ Clinton "War on Drugs" has led to the enormous surge in violent crime, despite its professed goals to the contrary.

If you want to have a good time and learn how to stop neo-con arguments cold, send in $39 to the Rothbard-Rockwell Report, Box 4091, Burlingame, California 94010. Or call 800-325-7265 and ask for Dana. If you want to help us keep the good fight going, please send something extra. If you send us $100 in all, I'll send you a nice surprise present. Not a great big deal, but I think you're really going to like it, too.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED